

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The claim amendments and arguments presented herein incorporate the claim amendments and arguments Applicants discussed with the Examiner during the phone interview on October 19th. Applicants submit that the arguments and amendments presented herein make the substance of the phone interview of record to comply with 37 CFR 1.133. The Examiner responded favorably to the proposed amendments and arguments and said he would reconsider the rejection in view of the arguments and amendments presented herein.

Applicants amended claims 11, 35, and 59 to change “the set of events” to “a set of events” to clarify the antecedent basis of this element.

1. Claims 1, 2, 4-12, 25, 26, 28-36, 49, 50, and 52- 60 are Patentable Over the Cited Art

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 4-12, 25, 26, 28-36, 49, 50, and 52- 60 as obvious (35 U.S.C. §103) over Raff (U.S. Patent No. 6,785,868) in view of Barnett (U.S. Patent No. 6,369,840) and in view of Strope (U.S. Patent No. 5,129,057). Applicants traverse with respect to the amended claims.

Amended claims 1, 25, and 49 concern accessing calendar information of users in a database for presentation by a personal information manager, and require: maintaining scheduled event records for users within the database, including a given user; maintaining information for the given user on shadowed events for a tracked entity that are part of the tracked entity’s scheduled event records, wherein the tracked entity was selected by the given user; providing from the database scheduled event records for the given user and information on shadowed events of at least one tracked entity, wherein the scheduled event records of the given user are capable of being scheduled at calendar times that overlap with scheduled shadowed events for the at least one tracked entity; displaying information on the provided scheduled event records and shadowed events for a time period in a view in response to displaying the given user’s scheduled event records; receiving selection from the given user to add a selected shadowed event to the given user’s scheduled event records; and enabling the user to select from the view to add the selected shadowed event to the given user’s scheduled event records in the database, wherein shadowed event records from the tracked entity added to the given user’s scheduled event records are displayed as part of the given user’s scheduled event records; and generating a conflict signal if scheduled event records for one user are scheduled for overlapping calendar

times, and wherein the conflict signal is not generated if at least one shadowed event record and scheduled event record for which the information is displayed are scheduled for overlapping calendar times.

Applicants amended claims 1, 25, and 49 to recite that the provided scheduled event records and shadowed events are displayed in a view and enabling the user to select from the view to add the tracked entity's scheduled event record comprising the selected shadowed event to the given user's scheduled event records in the database. These added requirements are disclosed on at least pg. 18, lines 1-17, pg. 22, lines 4-6, and FIGs. 13 and 14 of the Specification.

The Examiner found that Barnett teaches adding tracked entities shadowed event records to the user's personal database. (Fourth Office Action, pgs. 3-4) The Examiner modified Raff's discussion of shadowed event records with Barnett. Applicants traverse on the ground that Barnett and other cited art does not teach or suggest adding enabling the user to select a shadowed event, from the view displaying both shadowed events and user scheduled events, to add to the given user's scheduled events.

The Examiner cited col. 11, line 56, col. 12, line 8 and element 807 in FIG. 8 of Barnett as teaching adding a event to the user personal calendar. (Fourth Office Action, pg. 4) FIG. 8 shows a display of events from a selected category, not the user's own scheduled event. The categories of events to be displayed can be displayed as layers on top of one another. (Barnett, col. 11, lines 35-55). The user can add an event to the user personal calendar by clicking the check box 904 of the event to add and then clicking the button 807, labeled "add all checked events to your calendar". (Barnett, col. 12, lines 9-15).

Although the cited Barnett discusses how to add scheduled events of another to the user's events, nowhere does the cited Barnett or other art teach or suggest enabling the user to select a shadowed event from a view displaying both shadowed and user scheduled events to add to the user's scheduled events. Instead, the cited Barnett discusses how to add events displayed in a calendar separate from the user's events to the user's calendar. In Barnett, the user's personal calendar is displayed in a separate panel from the panel displaying the other events, not the same view as claimed.

The Examiner cited col. 9, lines 1-12 and col. 14, line 1 of Strope as teaching the claim requirements concerning generating a conflict signal a conflict signal for scheduled event records for one user at overlapping times. (Fourth Office Action, pg. 5). Applicants traverse.

The cited Strope discusses displaying a conflict signal in the form of horizontal lines or a blinking attribute to indicate scheduling conflicts. However, nowhere does the cited Strope anywhere teach or suggest generating conflict signals with respect to shadowed and scheduled events scheduled for overlapping times that are displayed in the same view. Further, the cited Strope discusses displaying conflict signals or indicators for conflicting events, but not in conjunction with shadowed events. Yet further, nowhere does the cited Strope anywhere teach or suggest not generating the conflict signal if shadowed and user scheduled events displayed in the same view conflict.

The Examiner cited Raff as teaching not generating a conflict signal if shadowed and user scheduled events are for overlapping times. (Fourth Office Action, pg. 4) Although Raff shows displaying tracked events of other users and the user events in a display and Strope discusses displaying a conflict signal for events scheduled at the same time, there is still no teaching or suggestion of both displaying a conflict signal for a view displaying both user scheduled and shadowed events when the user scheduled events conflict and not displaying a conflict signal when shadowed and user scheduled events conflict, all in the same view.

The Manual of Patent Examination and Procedure (“MPEP”) makes clear that the “mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination.” MPEP Sec. 2143.01, p. 2100-131 (Rev. 2, May 2004).

Here, neither Raff, Barnett nor Strope teach or suggest the combination of claim requirements of not generating a conflict signal for user scheduled event records and shadowed event records displayed in the same view scheduled at overlapping times in combination with generating conflict signals for user scheduled events at overlapping times. Nowhere is there any teaching or suggestion of this combination claim requirement for handling conflict signals for overlapping user scheduled event records and, separately, handling conflict signals for overlapping shadowed and user scheduled event records. Further, nowhere does the cited art suggest the desirability of the claimed conflict policy for different overlapping situations for user scheduled events and shadowed events and user scheduled events displayed in the same view.

Thus, even if the different references were found to teach each of the separate limitations, there is still no teaching or suggestion of the combination of claim requirements for how to handle conflict signals with respect to overlapping user scheduled event records and overlapping shadowed and user scheduled event records, where the scheduled event and shadowed events are displayed in a same view.

Accordingly, amended claims 1, 25, and 49 are patentable over the cited art because the cited combination of Raff, Barnett and Strope does not teach or suggest all the claim requirements.

Claims 2, 4-12, 26, 28-36, 50, and 52- 60 are patentable over the cited art because they depend from one of claims 1, 25, and 49. Moreover, the following dependent claims provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art.

Claims 8, 32, and 56 depend from claims 1, 25, and 49 and further require that if the selected shadowed event is scheduled for a calendar time overlapping a calendar time of a scheduled event record, then overriding the scheduled event record for the overlapping time period with the selected shadowed event.

The Examiner cited FIG. 17 of Raff as teaching the additional requirements of these claims. (Fourth Office Action, pg. 6) Applicants traverse.

The cited FIG. 17 of Raff shows how events of selected other users, e.g., wife and child, may be displayed with the default calendar events. Nowhere does the cited FIG. 17 anywhere teach or suggest that the selected shadowed event overrides overlapping scheduled event records. In fact, the cited FIG. 17 teaches away from this requirement because FIG. 17 shows shadowed and default user events with one another without overriding each other. There is no indication in FIG. 17 that the events of the other users, e.g., wife and child, override the default user's events.

Accordingly, claims 8, 32, and 56 provide additional requirements of patentability over the cited art because the additional requirements of these claims are not taught or suggested in the cited Raff.

2. Claims 3, 27, and 51 are Patentable Over the Cited Art

The Examiner rejected claims 3, 27, and 51 as obvious (35 U.S.C. §103) over Raff in view of Barnett and Strope, and further in view of Coleman (U.S. Patent No. 6,262,732). (Fourth Office Action, pgs. 8-9)

Claims 3, 26, and 51 depend from claims 2, 26, and 50 and further require that the information on the shadowed events is displayed as transparent text and the information on the scheduled events are displayed as solid text.

These claims are patentable over the cited art because they depend from base claims 1, 25, and 49, which are patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above and because the additional requirements of these claims provide further grounds of patentability over the cited art for the following reasons.

The Examiner cited Coleman as teaching transparent text and that it would be obvious to modify the shadowed events of Raff to display the shadowed events as transparent text with the motivation to provide the user with more information on a limited display. (Fourth Office Action, pg. 8-9) Applicants traverse.

Although the cited Coleman discusses transparent text, nowhere does either cited reference, Raff or Coleman, anywhere teach or suggest that shadowed events are displayed as transparent text and user scheduled events as solid text. There is simply no suggestion of the modification the Examiner proposes. Moreover, the purported motivation does not suggest that one use the particular claimed arrangement of transparent text for shadowed events and solid text for user events because there are many ways one may provide the user with more information on a limited display.

Accordingly, claims 3, 26, and 51 provide additional requirements of patentability over the cited art because the additional requirements of these claims are not taught or suggested in the cited Raff or Coleman.

3. Amended Claims 21, 24, 45, 48, 69, and 72 are Patentable Over the Cited Art

The Examiner found that claims 21, 24, 25, 48, 69, and 72 are obvious (35 U.S.C. §103) over Raff in view of Barnett, Strope, and Moon (U.S. Patent No. 6,064,975). Applicants traverse with respect to the amended claims.

Amended claims 21, 45, and 69 recite implementing a personal information manager in an electronic calendar device for a user, and require: displaying scheduled records for a designated time period of the user in the electronic calendar; providing scheduled event records for the user and information on shadowed events of at least one tracked person, wherein the scheduled event records are capable of being scheduled at calendar times that overlap with

scheduled shadowed events for the at least one tracked; displaying information on the provided scheduled event records and shadowed events for a time period in a view; and displaying location information providing a current location of the tracked person provided by an electronic device with the tracked person transmitting location information in the view; and generating a conflict signal if scheduled event records for one user are scheduled for overlapping calendar times, and wherein the conflict signal is not generated if at least one shadowed event record and scheduled event record for which the information is displayed are scheduled for overlapping calendar times.

Applicants amended claims 21, 45, and 69 to require that the scheduled event records and shadowed events for the time period are displayed in a same view and that the displayed location information for the tracked person is also displayed in that same view. These added requirements are disclosed on at least pg. 18, lines 1-17, pg. 22, lines 4-6, and FIGs. 13 and 14 of the Specification. Further, the location information, "(Gold's Gym)" in the view of FIG. 13 is for a shadowed user. (Specification, pg. 22, lines 7-18, FIG. 11, FIG. 13).

The Examiner cited col. 5, line 29 of Moon as teaching the additional requirements of these claims concerning the displaying of location information. (Fourth Office Action, pgs. 10-11) The cited col. 5 mentions that one can activate a button to indicate the location of a party with whom ones portable electronic device is having or had communication with. Although the cited Moon mentions displaying location information of another person or device, nowhere does the cited Moon or other art anywhere teach or suggest the combination of claim requirements of displaying location information on a tracked person whose shadowed events are displayed in the same view with the scheduled events of the user. This particular combination of displaying in the same view the location of tracked users whose shadowed events are displayed with user scheduled events is nowhere taught or suggested in the cited art.

Here, the Examiner is suggesting a modification nowhere taught or suggested in the cited art – displaying location information on a tracked person whose shadowed events are displayed with the scheduled events of the user in the same view. For this reason, the proposed modification is not proper.

The Examiner cited Strope for the conflict signal requirements. (Fourth Office Action, pg. 11) Applicants submit that the requirements of generating the conflict signal for overlapping user scheduled events and not generating the conflict signal for overlapping shadowed events

and user scheduled events that are displayed in the same view are not taught or suggested in the cited Strope, Barnett and Raff for the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 1, 25, and 49.

Accordingly, claims 21, 45, and 69 are patentable over the cited art because the cited combination of four references does not teach or suggest the claim requirements.

Claims 24, 58, and 72 are patentable over the cited art because they depend from claims 21, 45, and 69, which are patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above, and because the additional requirements of these claims in combination with the base claims provide further grounds of patentability over the cited art.

Conclusion

For all the above reasons, Applicant submits that the pending claims 1-5, 7-12, 21, 24-29, 31-36, 45, 48-53, 55-60, 69, and 72 are patentable over the art of record. Applicants submit herewith the fee for the one month extension of time. Should any additional fees be required, please charge Deposit Account No. 09-0447.

The attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact him at (310) 553-7977 if the Examiner believes such contact would advance the prosecution of the case.

Dated: October 26, 2006

By: /David Victor/

David W. Victor
Registration No. 39,867

Please direct all correspondences to:

David Victor
Konrad Raynes & Victor, LLP
315 South Beverly Drive, Ste. 210
Beverly Hills, CA 90212
Tel: 310-553-7977
Fax: 310-556-7984